



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.  |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 09/982,711   | 10/18/2001  | Taizo Shirai         | 09812.0590-00000    | 8666              |
| 22852  | 7590        | 06/19/2006           | EXAMINER            |                   |
| FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP<br>901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 |             |                      |                     | KHOSHNOODI, NADIA |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                   |
|  |             | 2137                 |                     |                   |

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/982,711             | SHIRAI ET AL.       |  |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-32.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Emmanuel L. Moise*  
**EMMANUEL L. MOISE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants contend that Hazard and Sudia fail to disclose a "cryptosystem unit that selectively uses a different encryption key for each sector from the first sector to the M-th sector." Examiner maintains that Hazard does in fact teach that there are plural keys for encryption where each key is associated with one of the number of items of sensitive information, i.e. a different encryption key for each sector (col. 4, lines 28-46 and col. 5, lines 1-22). Furthermore, Applicants contend that Hazard and Sudia fail to teach a "revocation list having revocation information regarding revoked media or content." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sudia et al. teach that the revocation list contains revoked privileges of users (par. 359-361). These revoked privileges are associated with content that the user may no longer access based on the revocation, hence revocation information regarding revoked content (par. 362). Therefore, Sudia suggests a revocation list having revocation information regarding revoked media/content from that specific user. Examiner would like to point out that in the limitation "revocation information regarding revoked media/content," the term "regarding" is broad and thus is broadly interpreted (See MPEP 2111). Applicants further contend that Hazard or Sudia fail to teach a "block permission table for accessing a permission table that describes memory access control information." Examiner respectfully disagrees. A block permission table for accessing a permission table that describes memory access control information is nothing more than a table that leads to various user rights to various elements stored in memory. Therefore, Sudia teaches a table that leads to each of the users' permissions with reference to the contents that should be accessible to them based on their privileges (par. 237). Finally, Applicants contend that Hazard and Sudia do not disclose "an integrity checking unit for checking the integrity of the revocation list and block permission table." Sudia suggests a THV (terminal hash value) is maintained for the stored privileges in order to maintain an integrity value for the privileges so that an unauthorized user does not gain access to contents that he/she is not meant to (par. 362-363). Since Sudia teaches that the revoked privileges (i.e. when the validity period expires) and normal user privileges each contain a hash value which will be checked in order to ensure that the integrity of that data has not been compromised (par. 78-83 and 99). Therefore, it is the Examiner's conclusion that the claims, as presented, are not patentably distinct from the prior arts of record.

Nadia Khushnoodi  
6/15/2006